**NBD-Requirements WG Meeting Minutes August 27 2013**

We discussed:

1. Current Status of 42 Use Cases (see <http://bigdatawg.nist.gov/usecases.php>)
2. With possible exception of one more Government Operations (where we are short) use case, this is it for V1.0. Further use cases will be accepted but separately tabulated as V2.0 collection.
3. There is a unique identifier – that of uploaded document – for use case. For example first use case “*Census 2010 and 2000 -- Title 13 Big Data”* is known as [M0147](http://bigdatawg.nist.gov/_uploadfiles/M0147_v1_9011190023.docx). Tools will be developed to map these non-intuitive labels into those easier to recognize
4. Geoffrey agreed to complete the 42 use case summaries in format discussed last week
5. Wo has already identified requirements for several use cases (those with labels up to M161). Karen G, Geoffrey and Pw Carey agreed to do others. The exact assignment will be refined by email
6. Wo will produce a document defining approach to identifying requirements using parts of M0125 and M0138. We will put all requirements into one of seven agreed categories (where 7th includes “other” in its label). The rather uncertain service abstractions can be postponed (candidates can be put in 7th category!).
7. Before September 2, we intend to complete all use case specific summaries and requirements; then we need to generalize requirements
8. There was an active discussion as to what architects should want; the use case or extracted requirements.

**Chat Log**

(10:58 AM) Geoffrey Fox joined.

(10:58 AM) Karen G joined.

(11:00 AM) Wo (guest) joined.

(11:06 AM) Karen G: 42 use cases - great!!

(11:06 AM) Geoffrey Fox: anybody awake please chat

(11:07 AM) Karen G disconnected.

(11:10 AM) Karen G joined.

(11:11 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC joined.

(11:12 AM) Karen G: Wo, is it possible to assign metadata to documents in the shared space?

(11:13 AM) Karen G: For example, industry.

(11:13 AM) Karen G: Just like Geoffrey just said.  :)

(11:16 AM) Karen G: I agree that a unique identifier is important; however is it possible to create a view by industry?

(11:16 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Such as 'demos' or 'for example...or 'such as....'....eh?

(11:17 AM) Karen G: Right - so when you download the use case, it saves the file with a more meaningful name?

(11:18 AM) PavithraKenjige ( PK Technologies)  joined.

(11:18 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Private Companys vs Public Companies....by Industry Breakdown FI, Retail, Defense, Life Sciences, Big vs Small....based upon Annual Revenue .... perhaps...?

(11:19 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: But each group and subgroup will have a corporate foot print/conducting business in the United States...and subject to US GRC Stds.....No...?

(11:21 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: So, if we establish the taxonomy grouping matrix (requirements) and then let the end user fit their entity/organization into the characteristics of the matrix....letting them do some thinking.....perhaps...?

(11:22 AM) PavithraKenjige ( PK Technologies)  disconnected.

(11:23 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: So we should get everything important done by our next meeting.....Sept. 3rd...2013...

(11:24 AM) Geoffrey Fox: yes

(11:24 AM) PavithraKenjige (PK Technologies)  joined.

(11:25 AM) Karen G: Geoffrey, I just noticed that you [or Wo] have set this page up so we can download ALL of the use cases in a single document.  That actually works fine, for anyone who might want to provide feedback / editorial comments via Microsoft Word.

(11:25 AM) Karen G: "click M0180 to download the full package of V1.0 Use Cases"

(11:26 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Ok, thanks....and yes, we'll be happy to review Mr. Fox's document....

(11:28 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Dear Mr. Chang, we'll be happy to help out, just tell us what you need....Respectfully yours, Pw

(11:30 AM) Karen G: It would be helpful to have a brief description of what \*should\* go in each section,  and how it maps to the format that Wo is using.

(11:31 AM) Karen G: OK - which document please?

(11:32 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Yes...we believe it's 138 Draft Requirements Report.....

(11:34 AM) \_CherryTom\_(\_IEEE-SA\_) joined.

(11:36 AM) Karen G: OK, so before extracting / mapping the requirements, do you see a need to review the use cases & ask clarifying questions?  OR, is it simply a matter of mapping the existing use case data into the corresponding Requirement categories?

(11:37 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Ok....we'll do.....Respectfully yours, Pw

(11:38 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Yes, please assign us what you want us to do...&...we can chat via email as well....no?

(11:40 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: However, you wish to  spread the glory is fine with us.....

(11:41 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Eco-system 26 thru 29....Pw gets to do these....

(11:41 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Plus any others, as well....

(11:42 AM) Karen G: OK, so before extracting / mapping the requirements, do you see a need to review the use cases & ask clarifying questions?  OR, is it simply a matter of mapping the existing use case data into the corresponding Requirement categories?Karen G: I'm not seeing the value of the latter, tbh... if it's simply extracting data into another format?Karen G: In my experience, architects are savvy enough to interpret use cases.  I'm afraid I'm missing something here.  :)

(11:46 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: This sounds like a 'plan'....

(11:47 AM) Karen G: Wo, have you started on any of the health & life sciences use cases?

(11:48 AM) Karen G: And the format you're showing - the tabular format - is what we're looking for?

(11:48 AM) Karen G: I will need to read them first, before committing.  :)

(11:48 AM) Karen G: Please don't publish all of my above comments in the minutes.  My least favorite skill is copying data from one format to a TABLE.  :)

(11:49 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: M0130, M0163, M0131 and M0189 are Pws obligation(s)......these are his duty assignments, responsibilities and obligations to Mr. Chang and Mr. Fox....

(11:50 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Dear Karen, we believe your comments are quite good, valid and useful....but it's your call of course....Respectfully yours, Pw

(11:51 AM) Karen G: I'm just a little concerned about version control of this document, and maintaining traceability back to the indiv use cases.

(11:51 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Once again, valid comments....

(11:53 AM) Karen G: So at this stage, we aren't AGGREGATING requirements across use cases - just mapping to a different format?

(11:53 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: And check the 'version no.'.....

(11:54 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Which requires the reviewer to update the version no. such as DRAFTs are Ver. 0.01....0.02.....0.03 et cetera....

(11:55 AM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: For example....

(12:04 PM) Karen G: I'm concerned that mapping from the use case format, to these broader requirements categories, \*might\* lose some detail & context.  I'd be inclined to focus on ensuring that the use cases are clear [and I assume they are, mostly] rather than doing a mapping exercise.  Just an opinion.

(12:05 PM) Karen G: otoh, 'needs to support varieties of datasets', isn't very precise.

(12:05 PM) Geoffrey Fox: The architecture group needs something simpler than 42 use cases. Use cases will be preserved

(12:08 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: A nice, sweet 'Executive Summary' would be a useful tool, then if the user wishes more detail, they can then go to the supporting use case for greater detail...No...?

(12:09 PM) Karen G: OK.  This is just a different approach from one I've used in the past.  My architect coworkers would really like the detail in the use case template.  Sorry for all the feedback - I understand!

(12:10 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Never a problem.....

(12:11 PM) Karen G: I would not specify 'need to use Hadoop' as a requirement, unless my organization had that as a must-have TECHNOLOGY requirement.

(12:12 PM) Karen G: Thanks Geoffrey, I agree.  Service abstractions isn't a familiar term to me.  I think the disconnect is that I am a business requirements analyst; I don't define the implementation approach.

(12:16 PM) Karen G:  Thankyou!!

(12:18 PM) Geoffrey Fox: I note we note really defing a real system but rather a "meta-system" that works across "all" use cases

(12:19 PM) Karen G: Do we actually have the detail described here?  This is getting into quite a lot of detail which i would not expect to find in the use cases.

(12:19 PM) Geoffrey Fox: You asked whats missing -- I think there are lots of Big Data projects that we don't have but how "different" they are is not clear.

(12:20 PM) Geoffrey Fox: In particular there are other important "Government Operations" we don't have

(12:21 PM) Geoffrey Fox: I think there may be other "Internet of Things" Use Cases that we don't have

(12:22 PM) Karen G: Was this level of detail requested of the folks who volunteered to provide use cases?  'complete speciric instructions'... 'completed detailed input and output operations for each instruction'?

(12:22 PM) Karen G: and data flows?  Sorry, I don't think so.

(12:23 PM) Karen G: Function calls - really.

(12:23 PM) Karen G: Please don't publish my comments in the minutes.  I'm afraid it sounds negative, but isn't meant to be.

(12:23 PM) Karen G: :)

(12:24 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Karen why not change your name to Pw.....&....it's all good....no?

(12:24 PM) Karen G: I just don't think we have the detail called out as the definition of a service abstraction....  Guess I need to read the use cases.

(12:24 PM) Karen G: Pw hah.

(12:24 PM) Karen G: What is the dial in pls?

(12:24 PM) Karen G: i can call

(12:24 PM) Karen G: or we can take it offline.

(12:25 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: [206-402-0823](tel:206-402-0823) pw 272-30-504

(12:25 PM) Karen G: cool

(12:25 PM) Karen G: dialing

(12:25 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: What a TEAM.....

(12:26 PM) Karen G: tryiing again - rings busy

(12:32 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Dear Karen: your friends approach sounds more like a 'how to'.....step-by-step requirement....is that correct...?

(12:33 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Along the lines of a Roles & Responsibility functionality.....perhaps....yes?

(12:44 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: We will check out Mr. Foxs High-level Descriptions....thanks.....

(12:46 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: M0125....

(12:47 PM) PavithraKenjige (PK Technologies) 26 joined.

(12:47 PM) PavithraKenjige (PK Technologies)  disconnected.

(12:47 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Sorry, that should be M0125\_v.1

(12:55 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Nice to hear your voice...and don't forget to jot down the tel. no. & pw......too....Respectfully yours, Pw

(12:56 PM) Karen G: nrxt steps

(12:58 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Finish everything by the end of this HOLIDAY WEEKEND.....ok...

(12:58 PM) Geoffrey Fox: yes

(12:59 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: Let's hear it for OT.....

(1:03 PM) Pw Carey, Compliance Partners, LLC: It's quite well organized...in our opinion....

(1:05 PM) \_CherryTom\_(\_IEEE-SA\_) disconnected.

(1:05 PM) Karen G disconnected.